



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Internal Passive in Semitic.—By FRANK R. BLAKE,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

IN the Semitic languages the passive may be expressed in several ways. Nearly all of these languages have a number of reflexive stems that are used for the passive, just as many forms of the Greek middle are so employed; e. g. Syriac ܐܡܝܬ ܐܝܬܗܩܬܝܠ, Ethiopic *tagatála*, Hebrew נִקְטַל *niqtál*, all meaning 'he was killed.' In Biblical Aramaic we have a passive which has the same form as the passive participle; cf. e. g. יְהִיבַת *îhîvath* 'she was given,' with בְּרִיךְ *bərîkh* 'blessed.' In Assyrian the various permansive forms have, in a majority of cases, a passive meaning; e. g. *petî* 'it is or was opened,' *ṣabît* 'it is or was captured,' *epuš* 'it is made,' *nukkumā* 'they were heaped up,' *šukhul* 'it is completed,' etc. But the passive formation which is most characteristically Semitic is the passive made by so-called internal vowel change;¹ e. g. Arabic قَتَلَ *qutla* 'he was killed,' which, from a superficial point of view, may be regarded as derived from the active قَتَلَ *qatala*, by changing the first two *a* vowels of the active to *u* and *i* respectively.

This so-called internal passive occurs in Arabic and Hebrew, and apparently also in Biblical Aramaic and Assyrian. In all these languages the forms have one feature in common, namely, they are all characterized by the presence of an *u* vowel in the first syllable.

In Arabic the passive perfect of the simple stem has the form قَتِلَ *qutla*, with *u* in the first syllable, and *i* between the second and third stem consonants. The imperfect is represented by the form يُقْتَلُ *îuqtalu*, which has likewise an *u* in the first syllable, but an *a* between the second and third stem consonants. Similar forms are made in all the derived conjugations, e. g.:

- II. قَتِّلَ *quṭṭila*, يُقْتَلُّ *îuqattalu*;
IV. اُقْتِلَ *uqṭila*, يُقْتَلُّ *îuqṭalu*;
V. تَقَتَّلَ *tuquṭṭila*, يُتَقَتَّلُ *îutaqattalu*, etc.

¹ Cf. Steintal-Misteli, *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaus* (Berlin, 1893) pp. 440, 461.

In Hebrew the internal passive is represented by the conjugations Pual and Hophal, together with a few forms of certain rarer conjugations. The common characteristics of all these forms are the *u* vowel of the first syllable, and the *a* vowel between the second and third stem consonants; e. g.:

Pual קטל *quṭṭal*, יקטל *ṣeqṭṭal*;

Hophal הקטל *həqṭal*, יקטל *ṣəqṭal*.

In Biblical Aramaic the internal passive occurs only in the causative stem, being represented by a number of Hophal perfects, e. g.: הנחת *həṇḥath*, 'he was deposed';

הוכר *həvadḥ*, 'he was annihilated'; etc.¹

These forms are in all probability due to the influence of Hebrew, as no corresponding forms occur in any other Aramaic dialect.² The passive stem פִּעֵל, e. g. יהיב *ṣēḥiv* 'it was given,' is not to be regarded as belonging to the same category as the internal passive formations in Arabic and Hebrew,³ but is best considered simply as an inflected passive participle.⁴

In Assyrian the permansive forms of the Piel and Shaphel, e. g. *kuššud* and *šukšud*, which have usually a passive meaning,⁵ may, in a general way, be compared with the internal passive formations in the languages just discussed. They appear, however, to be a specific Assyrian development, and are not to be regarded as the equivalents of the passive perfect forms of the intensive and causative stems in the cognate languages.⁶ In the Tell-el-Amarna tablets there occur a certain number of passive forms such as *ṣūdanu* 'it was given,' *ṣuṣmā* 'it was heard,' *ṣuqba'u* 'it is said,' *tulqā* 'it is taken,' etc., which correspond to the Arabic imperfect passive of the simple stem, e. g., *يقتل* *ṣuqṭalu*, and the Hebrew imperfect Hophal, e. g., יקטל *ṣəqṭal*. According to Professor

¹ For an enumeration of the forms, cf. Strack, *Gram. d. bibl. Aramäischen*, § 24 passim.

² So Luzzato, *Gram. of the Biblical Chaldaic Language*, § 44; Kautzsch, *Gram. d. Biblisch-Aramäischen*, §§ 23. 1, Anm. zu No. 2; § 34.

³ So Wright, *Comparative Gram.*, p. 224, 3 a.

⁴ So Kautzsch, § 29, 3; Marti, *Kurzgef. Gram. d. biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache*, § 49, d.

⁵ Cf. Zimmern, *Babylonische Busspsalmen* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 11; McCurdy, *Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Part 2, Section 1 (Leyden, 1883), p. 515; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*, p. 247 (English edition, p. 250).

⁶ Cf. however, L. Nix, *Zur Erklärung d. semitischen Verbalformen*, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (ZA.) vol. 10, pp. 189 ff.

Knudtzon, however, these are not genuine Assyrian forms, but are due to Canaanite influence.¹

Such, in brief, is the aspect which the internal passive presents in the different Semitic languages: in Arabic and Hebrew we find it in a highly developed condition; in Biblical Aramaic and Assyrian the few forms which clearly belong to this category are best regarded as due to foreign influence; in Syriac and Ethiopic there is not a trace of the formation.

Some grammarians believe that the internal passive existed in a highly developed form in parent Semitic; they regard Arabic as closest to the original type, and think that this formation has been lost in those languages where it does not appear.² But it is more natural to suppose that the internal passive is a late formation which was not developed to any extent except in Arabic and Hebrew (so Haupt), especially as Assyrian, which possesses at best only a few traces of such passive forms, presents a more archaic type than any other Semitic language.

The peculiar vocalism of these internal passive forms has, so far as I know, never been satisfactorily explained. The vowels between the second and third stem consonants, are, of course, to be regarded as the same as the characteristic vowels which we have in the intransitive verb (so Haupt), but the *u* of the first syllable, which is the most prominent characteristic of the internal passive, still remains problematical.³ It seems possible, however, to determine the origin of this *u*, as I hope to show in the following discussion of the forms of the internal passive in Arabic and Hebrew.

The Arabic passive forms of the simple stem, perfect *qatila*, imperfect *iqṭalu*, bear a strong resemblance to the intransitive verbal forms, perfect *qatila*, imperfect *iqṭalu*. In fact, the only difference lies in the vowel of the initial syllable, which is *a* in the intransitive, but *u* in the passive.

¹ See *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, 4, 410 and cf. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum* (London, 1892), p. xiii; Bezold, *Oriental Diplomacy* (London, 1893), p. 119; Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 2, f.

² So Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 222; Dillmann-Bezold, *Gram. d. äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 137.

³ Professor Haupt has suggested that in the form *qatila* we have, in some way, a combination of the characteristic vowels of the intransitive forms *qatila* and *qatula*.

In addition to this similarity of form, we find a great similarity of meaning. As Professor Reckendorf¹ has pointed out, the meaning of the passive form is in many instances simply intransitive like that of the verbs *fa'ila*, especially in the case of verbs denoting disease, e. g. جَسِيَ *jusī'a* 'to be or become hard, tough;' زُهِيَ *zuhī'a* 'to be proud, boastful;' مُشِقَ *mušīqa* 'be graceful;' حَقِقَ *ḥumiqa* 'have an eruption of the skin, small-pox[?];' رُئِيَ *ru'ī'a* 'have a complaint of the lungs,' etc., etc. Not infrequently the passive and intransitive forms from the same root are identical in meaning; e. g. ثَبَّ *thu'iba* and *tha'iba* 'be relaxed, sluggish;' لَقِمَ *luqī'a* and *laqī'a* 'be pregnant, conceive;' نَزَلَ *nuzila* and *nazila* 'suffer with catarrh;' نَهَمَ *nuhima* and *nahima* 'be greedy,' etc., etc.

Such a striking likeness, both in form and meaning, suggests that the internal passive may be nothing but a subsequent differentiation of the intransitive form, and this is borne out by a careful study of the formation of the imperfect.

According to Professor Haupt,² the preformatives of the third person of the parent Semitic imperfect were originally simply the vowels *u* or *i*. These were, in all probability, pronouns of the third person used indiscriminately for the masculine or feminine, and are apparently identical with the final element of Hebrew הָא *hā'*, הִי *hī'*, Assyrian *šā, šī*, and with the initial element of Ethiopic *ḡē'ētā, ḡē'ētī*. In Arabic the *i* and *u* preformatives are modified by analogical influences to *īa* and *īu*; in Hebrew the *i* appears as *īi* (pronounced *i*), the *u*, however, has no distinctly marked representative.³

These preformatives *i* and *u* were differentiated at a very early period, *i* being adopted for the Qal and Niphal, *u* for the intensive and causative stems. For example, from Assyrian *kašādu* 'to conquer,' we have *ikāšad* and *ikkašad* (for *inkašad*), but

¹ *Syntaktische Verhältnisse d. Arabischen* (Leyden, 1895), § 25.

² In a paper on *The Vowels of the Preformatives of the Imperfect in Semitic*, read before the American Oriental Society, at Cambridge, in 1899; cf. vol. 20 of this *Journal*, pp. 367, 370, No. 13. The paper will be published in one of the Johns Hopkins University Circulars for the current year (1901).

³ The preformative of the imperfect Piel *īē* presumably represents *u* or *īu*, but it might just as well stand for *īa* or *īi*.

ukaššad and *ušakšad*. The *u* preformative of the simple stem,¹ however, seems to have been preserved in the Hebrew form יוכל *îûkal*,² which is not passive but the regular imperfect of the intransitive verb יכל *îākōl* 'to be able,' whose first consonant is ' representing original ʕ. The verbs primæ , in Arabic have imperfects passive of exactly the same form as יוכל, e. g. يولد *îûladu* 'he will be born;' يوجد *îûjadu* 'it will be found;' etc. These formations differ from the imperfect passive of the strong verb, as e. g. يقتل *îuqtalu*, only in the fact that their initial , quiesces and lengthens the preceding short *u*; consequently יוכל *îûkal* and *îuqtalu* may be regarded as representing essentially the same verbal form.³

¹ In certain Arabic dialects the *u*-preformative was used in imperfect forms with characteristic *u*, e. g. *nu'budu* for *na'budu*; cf. Wright-de Goeje, I, § 94, c, B. The by-form with *u* was here preserved under the influence of the following *u*-vowel, just as the by-form *hi* instead of *hu* is preserved in cases like *biḡadihi* under the influence of the preceding *i*-vowel.

² This form has usually been explained in one of two ways: (1) It is regarded as an imperfect Qal from an original form *îaukal*, which was contracted to *îôkal*, and then modified to *îûkal*; so Bickell, *Outlines of Heb. Gram.*, p. 33; Stade, § 486; König, *Lehrgebäude*, II, p. 407; II, 1, p. 484, top; Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 69, v. But in the 3 m. s. imperf. Qal, except in the case of verbs primæ gutturalis, we should expect a preformative *îi*, which would probably have yielded **îîkal* (< **îiûkal*), the ʕ being first changed to ' under the influence of the preceding *i*, and then quiescing in it: cf. Arabic الغَارِى *الغَارِو. Moreover, the change from *îôkal* to *îûkal* is not satisfactorily explained. (2) It is regarded as an imperfect Hophal like יובל 'he was led,' meaning 'he was rendered able or capable.' So Olshausen, p. 586; Ewald, *Ausführl. Lehrb.*, p. 336, b; A. Müller, *Schulgram.*, p. 95, s. No form either of the perfect Hophal or of the Hiphil, however, is made from this root. The proper name יהובל Jer. 37, 3, which occurs also in Jer. 38, 1, in the form יובל, has sometimes been cited as showing that יובל belongs to the Hophal. In all probability, however, the first part of יובל is the divine name יה or יהו; cf. Böttcher, § 475, f. The form יובל occurs also in Biblical Aramaic alongside of the more usual form יכל. Here, however, it is best regarded as a Hebraism; cf. Kautzsch, *Bibl.-Aram. Gr.*, p. 68.

³ The form יובל is certainly not identical with the Assyrian present of the verb primæ , like *uššab* 'I sit,' *urrad* 'I descend,' impt. *ûšib*,

The Arabic imperfect passive of the simple form, therefore, may be looked upon as an intransitive imperfect with characteristic *a* between the second and third stem consonants, and with *u* preformative; that is to say, it differs from the ordinary intransitive imperfect *īaqṭalu* only in that the preformative has an *u* instead of an *a* vowel.

In the intransitive verbs of the form *qatila*, then, the imperfects with both *i* and *u* preformatives were preserved, the forms with *u* preformative being more or less exclusively used in a passive sense, thus presenting an example of the general linguistic principle of the arbitrary differentiation or adaptation of coexisting byforms for special purposes.

Now as there existed side by side the intransitive forms *qatila* and *īaqṭalu* with *a* in the first syllable, corresponding as perfect and imperfect, and the passive imperfect *īuqṭalu* with *u* vowel in the first syllable, by a perfectly natural proportional analogy the perfect *qatila* was formed, as follows: *īaqṭalu*: *qatila* :: *īuqṭalu*: *qutila*. Such a derivation of the form *qutila*, moreover, is in accordance with one of the fundamental principles of Comparative Semitic Grammar, which was stated by Professor Haupt as early as 1878,¹ namely that the perfect is in a great many cases a secondary form, later than, and often influenced by the imperfect.²

The Arabic internal passive is not confined to the simple form, but is made, as we have seen, from all the principal verbal stems, e. g. II قَتَلَ *quttila*, يُقَتَّلُ *īuqattalu*; X اُسْتُقْتِلَ *ustuqtila*, يَسْتَقْتَلُ *īustagtalu*; etc. These forms, however, are best regarded as based on the analogy of the passive of the simple stem.

The passives of the verbs primæ infirmæ, e. g. وَلِدَ *ulida*, and tertiæ infirmæ, e. g. قُذِيَ *quḍiḍa*, are plainly of the same type as

ūrid (Delitzsch, § 112). The doubling of the second stem consonant in these forms does not indicate length of the preceding vowel, but must be explained in the same way as in the present forms of the verbs primæ ٔ, e. g. *īaxxaz* 'he takes,' *īkkal* 'he eats,' etc. (Delitzsch, § 103).

¹ JRAS, 1878, p. 244.

² With regard to the derivation of the passive from intransitive forms, cf. the frequent use in Assyrian of the intransitive form corresponding to Hebrew כָּבֵד *kāvēdh* 'he was heavy,' Arabic فَرِحَ *fariḥa* 'he rejoiced,' in a passive sense; e. g. *šakin* 'it is placed,' *šabit* 'it is or was taken,' etc. (Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gram.*, p. 237; Eng. ed., p. 239.)

the passive of the strong verb, and the passive of the verbs mediæ geminatæ, e. g. *فُرَّ* *furra*, *فُورِت* *furirta*, may also perhaps be so regarded; in the verbs mediæ infirmæ, however, the passive presents a different aspect.

Here the perfect passive of the simple stem is nearly always of the form *قِيلَ* *qīla* (he was called) with middle vowel *i*, though a few rare forms with middle vowel *ū* such as *قُول* *qūla*, also occur.¹ These forms are explained by Wright² as contracted from **quyila*.

The verbs mediæ infirmæ, however, must be considered with August Müller (ZDMG. 33, 698), Nöldeke (*Syr. Gr.*³ § 177), Stade (§ 143, 2), and others as two-consonantal forms, with the middle vowel lengthened to conform them to the prevailing three-consonantal type. The passives like *قِيل* and *قُول* are to be compared with the Hebrew passive participles like *שִׁים* *śīm* 'placed,' and *מִל* *māl* 'circumcised,' and indirectly with the Arabic passive participial forms like *مَقُول* *maqūl* 'called' and *مَسِير* *masīr* 'traveled,' where the initial syllable *ma* appears to be secondary, due to the analogy of the participles of the derived forms (so Haupt).

Such a comparison is perfectly natural, as instances in which participial and finite verbal forms are identical are by no means rare in Semitic; cf., e. g., the Hebrew participles and verbal adjectives *כָּבֵד* *kāvēdh* 'heavy' and *קָטַן* *qāṭōn* 'small,' with the intransitive verbs *kāvēdh* 'he was heavy,' *qāṭōn* 'he was small;'

¹ Other examples of the same form are *هُوب* *hūba* 'he was regarded with awe, veneration,' *سُئِلَ* *sūla* 'he was asked.'

² *Comp. Gram.*, p. 244.

³ In the verbs mediæ infirmæ the participle and the 3 s. m. perf. are identical even when the verb has the transitive form; we have not only *מֵת* *mēth*, *בֹּשׁ* *bōš*, but also *קָם* *qām* as participle and perfect: so Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 273, fn. 1; cf. however, Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 72, g. The participle and 3 s. m. perf. Niphal of verbs of this class are also identical in form, e. g. cf. *נָסוּג* *nāsōgh*, perfect, with *נִבּוֹן* *nāvōn*, participle. Moreover, the participle and 3 s. m. perf. Niphal of the strong verb, e. g. *נִקְטַל* *niqtāl* and *נִקְטַל* *niqtal*, are to be regarded as representing the same form, since the original short *a* of a final syllable is lengthened under the influence of the accent in nominal forms, but preserved short in the forms of the verb; cf., for example, *דָּבָר* *dāvār* 'word' with *הָרַג* *hārāgh* 'he killed,' which both go back to the ground-form *qātāl*. There is also a small number of participles

Arabic **فرح** *fariḥun* 'glad' and **شكس** *šakusun* 'stubborn' with *fariḥa* 'he was glad,' *šakusa* 'he was stubborn.' In Biblical Aramaic, indeed, inflected passive participles are used for the passive perfect, just as we have supposed in the case of *qīla* and *qāla*; cf., for example, **גמיר** *gēmīr* 'completed,' **זקף** *zēqīf* 'raised,' with **יהיבת** *iḥīvath* 'it was given,' **יהיבו** *iḥīvā* 'they were given,' etc.¹ Moreover, in the verbs mediæ infirmæ, the form **שם** *sīm* (=Hebrew *sīm*) corresponding exactly in form to Arabic **قيل** *qīla*, is used both as passive participle and as finite passive.

The passive perfect of the verbs mediæ infirmæ, therefore, is of an entirely different type from that of the strong verb. In the latter, the perfect is formed on the basis of an intransitive imperfect with *u* preformative, while in the verbs mediæ infirmæ, an inflected passive participial form is employed for the perfect.²

It has already been shown in the discussion of the strong verb, that the passive and intransitive forms are closely related. A similar connection appears in the case of verbs mediæ infirmæ. The first and second persons perfect of the intransitive verb **خاف** *xāfa* 'he feared,' are *xiftu*, *xifta*, etc., usually explained as contracted from **xaxiftu*, **xaxifta*, etc.³ But the first and second persons of the passive perfect have the same form, e. g. *qiltu* 'I was called,' *qilta*, etc. It is not improbable that the two series of forms are identical, and that the third person singular perfect of the intransitive verbs was originally the same as the corresponding form of the passive, viz. **قيل** *qīla*, or rather the pretriconsonantal type *qīla*, with short *i*, i. e. a form like **מת**.⁴ The

of the passive Qal which bear the same relation to the 3 s. m. of the corresponding perfects; e. g., **לקח** *luqqāh* 'taken,' etc., cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 52, s.

¹ Cf. also Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*², § 64, and Crit. Notes on Proverbs, in *The Polychrome Bible*, p. 35, l. 15.

² In Biblical Aramaic, as we have seen, this type of passive is made also in the strong verb; we have not only **שם** *sīm*, but also forms like **יהיב** *iḥīv*.

³ So Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 245.

⁴ This is the only certain instance in the verb in Hebrew. In the noun, however, the examples of this form are more numerous, e. g. **גר** *gēr* 'stranger,' **כן** *kēn* 'righteous,' **זר** *zēdh* 'haughty,' **לץ** *lēṣ* 'mockers,' **עד** *ēdh* 'witness.' In several of the forms quoted by Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.*², § 98 C, the *ē* was originally an *ā*; for instance, *kēfā* 'stone,' Assyr. *kāpu*; cf. *ibid.*, § 97.

form with long *i* is found in Assyrian *mīt*, 'he died,' Syriac ܡܝܬ *mīth*. For this form, identical with the perfect passive قَبِل *qīla*, perfects like خَاف *xāfa* 'he feared,' مَاتَ *māta* 'he died,' made on the analogy of transitive forms like قَالَ *qāla* 'he said,' have been substituted.

In Arabic, therefore, the evidence is strongly in favor of the theory that the internal passive is simply a differentiation from the intransitive form, the imperfect with *u* preformative being the germ of the formation. The same theory is supported by the evidence of the forms in Hebrew.

Here the principal passive forms are the so-called Pual and Hophal, e. g., Pual : קָטַל *quṭṭal*, יָקַמַל *iḥquṭṭal*; Hophal : הִקְטַל *hōqṭal*, יִקְטַל *iḥqṭal*. It has been recognized for many years, however, that a considerable number of Pual perfects and Hophal imperfects are really passives of Qal,¹ so we may assume that Hebrew formerly possessed the following passive formations from the simple stem, viz., perfect *qutal*, without doubling of the second stem consonant, and imperfect *iḥqṭal*.

The imperfect is here as in Arabic to be regarded as the nucleus of the passive formations. It was originally, like the Arabic form, an intransitive imperfect with *u* preformative, as for example יָכַל *iḥkal*, 'he will be able.' On the basis of this imperfect, a perfect *qutal* with *u* in the first syllable was made, the vowel of the second syllable, however, being *a*, the same as that of the imperfect, and not *i* as in Arabic *quṭila*. It is not impossible, however, that the vowel of the second syllable was originally *i*, which was changed to *a* under the influence of the imperfect.

The passive formations with *u* in the first syllable and characteristic intransitive *a* vowel, were then extended to the derived conjugations Piel and Hiphil, giving the Pual and Hophal. Scattered instances of rarer passive conjugations also occur; for example, אָמַל *umlal* 'it withered'; כָּלְכְלוּ *kōlkēlū*, 'they were nourished'; הִתְפַּקְרוּ *hōthpāqēdhū*, 'they were counted'; etc.

Besides the internal passive of Qal, there is another stem, the Niphal, originally reflexive, which has come to be used as the regular passive of Qal. This fact has in all probability prevented any extensive growth of the internal passive of the simple stem, and the forms which had already been developed came to be

¹ Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, §§ 52, *e*; 53. *u*. See also *Hebraica*, 3, 39.

regarded at a later period as belonging to the passives of the derived conjugations, the perfect being assimilated to the Pual, from which it differed only in the doubling of the middle radical, the imperfect to the Hophal, with which it was identical, just as the Arabic imperfect passive forms of the simple and causative stems are identical, both being represented by the form *īuqtalu*.

The doubling of the second stem consonant in the perfect passive forms of Qal is probably only an orthographic device of the Masorites to preserve the short vowel in an open syllable, just as in קָטַנָה, from קָטַן *small*; אָדַמָה, from אָדָם *red*; עָרַמִּים, from עָרָם *naked*; עֲנֻלָּה, from עָנַל *round*; קָטַנָה, from קָטַן *small*; גִּמְלִים, from גִּמַּל *camel*, etc., etc.

The Semitic internal passive, therefore, may be regarded as having its origin in an intransitive imperfect of the simple form with *u* preformative, a form such as, for example, the Hebrew יוֹכַל *yākal* 'he will be able.' The passive value which is apparently inherent in the *u* vowel of the initial syllable, and the *a* vowel between the second and third stem consonants, is simply due to the presence of these vowels in these same positions in this intransitive imperfect form.

On the basis of this imperfect, a perfect form was made, having like the imperfect an *u* in the initial syllable; in Arabic, the form *qutīla*, with *i* in the second syllable, due to the influence of the intransitive perfects like فَرِحَ *fariḥa* 'to rejoice'; in Hebrew, the form *qutal*, which has either retained the characteristic *a* vowel of the intransitive imperfect or changed the *i* of *qutīla* to *a* on the analogy of this imperfect, or possibly of the active forms.

The passive thus established in the simple form was extended by analogy to the derived conjugations. In Arabic the internal passive of the simple form remains as such alongside of the passive of the intensive, causative, etc.; in Hebrew, however, the extensive use of the originally reflexive Niphal as the passive of Qal has prevented any extensive development of the internal formation in this stem, the forms which occur being misunderstood and considered as belonging to the derived conjugations, the perfect, to the Piel, the imperfect, to the Hophal.